



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,681	12/31/2003	Ross Koningstein	16113-0639001-GP-223-00-U	1968
26192 7590 03/19/2009 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER BRANDENBURG, WILLIAM A				
ART UNIT 3622		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/19/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/748,681

**Applicant(s)**

KONINGSTEIN, ROSS

**Examiner**

WILLIAM A. BRANDENBURG

**Art Unit**

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/26/2009 has been entered.

***Response to Amendment***

2. The following is a Non-Final Office Action in response to communications received on 01/26/2009 for Request for Continued Examination (RCE). No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 6-11, 18-20, 23-28, 31, 35-37, 40-45 and 50 have been amended. No claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-51 are pending and addressed below.

***Priority***

3. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed provisional application, U.S. Patent Application No. 60/516,281 filed November 3, 2003, under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

***Claim Objections***

4. The amendment filed on 01/26/2009, has corrected the claim objections identified in the Office Action dated 10/16/2008. Thus, the Examiner hereby withdraws the claim objections of claims 24, 32, 36, 45 and 50 that were raised in the Office Action dated 10/16/2008.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 18-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 18-34 recite the term "means for" and the Examiner is uncertain whether or not the Applicant is invoking 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. Since there is no specific definition in the application's specification of what is included as a "means for," 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph, is not properly invoked and as such, the Examiner will interpret this to mean 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph, is not invoked. See MPEP § 2181(II).

Claim 35 recites in the preamble that the claim is directed towards the statutory category of an apparatus. However, the body of claim 35 comprises what appears to be a series of "modules", and is thus directed towards function descriptive material. Therefore, it is not clear how a series of "modules" (or functional descriptive material) constitutes an apparatus. Clarification is required. For examination purposes, the Examiner is interpreting the apparatus to be satisfied by any apparatus which performs the claimed method.

Claims 36-51 depend from claim 35 and contain the same deficiencies. Therefore, claims 36-51 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. Clarification is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Based on Supreme Court precedent, a method/process claim must (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) (see at least *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing (see at least *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 71 (1972)). A method/process claim that fails to meet one of the above requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 for patent eligible subject matter.

Here claim 1 fails to meet the above requirements because the steps are neither tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) nor physically

transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. The Examiner notes that although claim 1 recites a "computer-implemented method", this preamble recitation in and of itself is not enough to overcome 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 1, for example, is drawn to method steps of delivering and receiving. However, it is apparent that several of these steps are extra-solution activity (such as delivering and receiving), none of which tie the method to a machine or apparatus. See In re Bilski, 99 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008) for further explanation or discussion related to extra-solution activity, especially footnote 14.

Generally, in order to tie the method to a machine or apparatus, there needs to be a positive recitation of a significant step (to illustrate the need, in converse to the term used in Bilski, this may be termed solution activity) being performed by the machine or apparatus.

No such recitation or indication is present in claim 1 of any physical transformation. Claim 1, then is not tied to another statutory class, nor is it physically transforming matter. Therefore claim 1 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Similar analysis can be done for independent claims 18 and 35. Furthermore, claims 2-17, 19-34 and 36-51 depend from claims 1, 18 and 35, respectively, and do not cure the deficiencies set forth above. As such, claims 2-17, 19-34 and 36-51 are also rejected for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 35 recites an apparatus comprising what appears to be a series of software modules, neither of which are recorded on a computer-readable medium. As per MPEP 2106.01, functional descriptive material is non-statutory when claimed as descriptive material per se and not structurally or functionally interrelated to a computer-readable medium. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 36-51 depend from claim 35 and do not cure the deficiencies set forth above. As such, claims 36-51 are also rejected for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-12, 14-15, 18-29, 31-32, 35-46 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petropoulos et al. (US 2003/0146939 A1) (hereinafter Petropoulos).**
8. Applicant(s) are reminded that optional or conditional elements do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted. See e.g. MPEP §2106 II C: "Language that suggest or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.  
  
"As a matter of linguistic precision, optional elements do not narrow the claim because they can always be omitted." In

Art Unit: 3622

*re Johnston*, 435 F.3d 1381, 77 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (where the Federal Circuit affirmed the Board's claim construction of "further including that said wall may be smooth, corrugated, or profiled with increased dimensional proportions as pipe size is increased" since "this additional content did not narrow the scope of the claim because these limitations are stated in the permissive form 'may.'").

As a courtesy, the Examiner has bolded the claim language that is considered optional.

9. Please note that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *e.g. In re Collier*, 158 USPQ 266, 267 (CCPA 1968) (where the court interpreted the claimed phrase "a connector member for engaging shield means" and held that the shield means was not a positive element of the claim since "[t]here is no positive inclusion of 'shield means' in what is apparently intended to be a claim to structure consisting of a combination of elements."

As a courtesy, the Examiner has bolded and italicized the claim language consider as intended use below.

10. As per claim 1, Petropoulos discloses a computer-implemented method for advertising comprising the steps of:  
delivering a first electronic document including an electronic advertisement in a compacted display format, wherein the electronic advertisement **can be transitioned** from the compacted display format into an expanded display format upon a first user selection of an expansion icon associated with the electronic advertisement, the expanded display format comprising one or more menu options and a reference to a network location for retrieving specified content associated with each menu option ([0020], search results page contains first result "53" and second result "54", see also Fig. 1, "53" and "54", see also [0023-25], preview window renders content inline with particular result, see also [0038], preview icon alerts a user to the preview feature and allows user to select preview using navigation of mouse pointer, see also Fig. 1, "63" and "64");  
receiving a second user selection of one of the one or more menu options after the electronic advertisement has been

transitioned from the compact display format to the expanded display format in the first electronic document ([0032], preview information is an advertisement, see also [0042], preview information display over current window or in preview window, functional attributes of preview window include hyperlinks that a user can mouse over or click on, see also [0054], user may initiate a menu or control system for the controlling the function of the available preview functions, see also Fig. 1, "55").

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

delivering a second electronic document including content from the referenced network location associated with the menu option selected and including the electronic advertisement in the expanded display format.

However, Petropoulos does teach enabling active hyperlinks in preview windows that when clicked result in a call to the referenced page as well as enabling further mouse-over, which allows the user to use mouse-over in the preview pane ([0042], see also [0073-79]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include delivering content associated with a selected menu option including the advertisement in the expanded display format. The rationale for this inclusion would enable Petropoulos to deliver the content while maintaining the advertising component in direct view of the user. This increase in ad exposure could result in a higher probability of conversion. Furthermore, the Examiner notes that although Petropoulos does not explicitly teach what exactly occurs in the main browser window when they hyperlink in the preview window is selected, it would be an obvious design choice to program the browser layout to display in such a fashion as claimed in the instant application.

11. As per claim 2, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 1 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose wherein one of the menu options includes a home menu option and further comprising:

receiving a selection of the home menu option; and

delivering the first electronic document including the electronic advertisement in the compact display format.

However, Petropoulos does teach a dedicated preview icon that can function as a menu for controlling previewing ([0010]). In addition, Petropoulos teaches advanced preview icon implementation including separating regions in the preview icon which allows the user to dynamically and automatically determine what to preview via a variety of menu buttons ([0060-61], see also Fig. 5, "552", "Home Page"). Furthermore, Petropoulos teaches a mouse-over technology in which the user may simply move the pointer away from the preview and the window will close and return to the original display ([0054]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include a home menu option to return to the original display. The rationale for this inclusion is a home option allows a user to easily return to the original content display to avoid the hassle of the typical backward-forward movement in a browser setting. The Examiner notes that although Petropoulos teaches various menu options, but does not explicitly teach a home option specifically in the preview window (i.e. expanded

display), the taught menu options could easily include a home menu option. Furthermore, there are a limited number of predictable ways to transition back to the original format. For example, one could either close the preview window (i.e. expanded display) by clicking a typical close "x" button, select a coded "home" button as disclosed in the instant application, or "deselect" (i.e. move away the cursor) the window as is taught by Petropoulos. As such, it would be obvious for Petropoulos to include a home menu option as opposed to its current teachings because the mouse-over technology yields the same functionality of returning to the original display format that the home menu option provides.

12. As per claim 3, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 1 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the electronic advertisement comprises a morphing electronic advertisement that includes instructions for interpreting user actions to enable an end user system to display the compact display format and the expanded display format ([0023-25], instructions are sent to render content inline with particular result, see also [0042], preview information displayed over the current window or in a

Art Unit: 3622

window which already exists on results page such as a preview window that can be located anywhere on the results page).

13. As per claim 4, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 1 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the first and second electronic document comprise web pages ([0010], preview information is a "preview window" containing relevant preview information of actual page or document associated with item in results list, see also [0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result).

14. As per claim 5, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 4 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the network locations specified in reference to the one or more menu options comprise network locations provided by or affiliated with a host entity that delivered the first electronic document and the electronic advertisement ([0025-26], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0029], contextual information regards URL pertaining to web page, see also [0042], enabling active



hyperlinks in preview windows so that a mouse-over or click result in a call to the referenced page as well as enabling further mouse-over, which allows the user to use mouse-over in the preview pane).

15. As per claim 6, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 1 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses further comprising:

wherein the electronic advertisement comprises a target reference to an advertiser network location ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

storing a price parameter value in association with the electronic advertisement.

However, Petropoulos does teach a user's use of preview information is monitored while the user reviews the results page. More specifically, it monitors which result is being previewed by order or rank, the length of each preview, whether there is a click-through, etc. The attributes of user

Art Unit: 3622

behavior are forwarded across the network and later used to improve relevancy ([0072-79]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include storing a price parameter associated with the electronic advertisement. The Examiner notes that in a electronic advertising environment, it is common for there to be a direct correlation between price and performance parameters. As such, the act of monitoring performance (i.e. user interaction) in an online environment provides a way to measure the effectiveness of the content issued to the user, whether it be search results, banner advertisements, etc. Therefore, although Petropoulos does not explicitly teach storing a price value, it would be obvious for a price value to be present as a result of the monitoring and tracking of user performance recited in the teachings of Petropoulos.

16. As per claim 7, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 6 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses further comprising:

receiving a third user selection of the target reference, wherein performance is determined to have occurred upon

receipt of the selection of the target reference ([0042], functional attributes of preview window include hyperlinks that a user can mouse over or click on which would result in a call to the referenced page).

17. As per claim 8, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 6 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses further comprising:

receiving an indication of user activity associated with the expanded display format, wherein performance is determined to have occurred upon receipt of the indication of the user activity ([0042], functional attributes of preview window include the use of a scroll bar, hyperlinks that a user can mouse over or click on which would result in a call to the referenced page, etc., see also [0073], attributes of user behavior tracked and monitored).

18. As per claim 9, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 8 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the user activity comprises a predetermined period of time viewing the expanded display format ([0042], user can dynamically control the duration of the preview window visibility, see also [0073-75], user's use

of preview information monitored including the length of each preview, a long duration indicates high relevancy to a particular result).

19. As per claim 10, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 8 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the user activity comprises the user request to view the expanded display format ([0010], displaying preview information associated with each result item, see also [0025], preview information shown when there is a mouse-over a defined area, see also [0073], user's use of preview information monitored including which result is being previewed).

20. As per claim 11, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 8 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the user activity comprises a predetermined number of user selections of the one or more menu options available in the expanded display format ([0026], preview information include URLs, with respect to URLs used as preview information these URLs will function as links, see also [0054], user may initiate a menu or control system for controlling the function of the available preview functions,

see also [0060-62], user interacts with menu options, see also Fig. 5, "552").

21. As per claim 12, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 1 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses further comprising:

associating a reference to the electronic advertisement for use by the user in retrieving the electronic advertisement ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0029], contextual information regards URL pertaining to web page, see also [0032], preview information includes tags defining the information to be previewed).

22. As per claim 14, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 1 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein, the second electronic document comprises a document provided by the advertiser ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0032], preview information includes an advertisement).

23. As per claim 15, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 14 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos further discloses

wherein, the document provided by the advertiser comprises a web page from the advertiser's web site ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0036], web page is actual web page referred by and associated with first result).

24. As per claim 18, Petropoulos discloses an apparatus for delivering advertising comprising:

an electronic advertisement output means for delivering a first electronic document including an electronic advertisement in a compact display format, wherein the electronic advertisement **can be transitioned** from the compact display format into an expanded display format upon a first user selection of an expansion icon associated with the electronic advertisement, the expanded display format comprising one or more menu options and a reference to a network location for retrieving specified content associated with each menu option ([0020], search results page contains first result "53" and second result "54", see also Fig. 1,

"53" and "54", see also [0023-25], preview window renders content inline with particular result, see also [0038], preview icon alerts a user to the preview feature and allows user to select preview using navigation of mouse pointer, see also Fig. 1, "63" and "64");

selection receiving means for receiving a second user selection of one of the one or more menu options after the electronic advertisement has been transitioned from the compact display format to the expanded display format ([0032], preview information is an advertisement, see also [0042], preview information display over current window or in preview window, functional attributes of preview window include hyperlinks that a user can mouse over or click on, see also [0054], user may initiate a menu or control system for the controlling the function of the available preview functions, see also Fig. 1, "55").

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

delivery means for delivering a second electronic document including content from the referenced network location associated with the menu option selected and including the electronic advertisement in the expanded display format.

However, Petropoulos does teach enabling active hyperlinks in preview windows that when clicked result in a call to the referenced page as well as enabling further mouse-over, which allows the user to use mouse-over in the preview pane ([0042], see also [0073-79]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include delivering content associated with a selected menu option including the advertisement in the expanded display format. The rationale for this inclusion would enable Petropoulos to deliver the content while maintaining the advertising component in direct view of the user. This increase in ad exposure could result in a higher probability of conversion. Furthermore, the Examiner notes that although Petropoulos does not explicitly teach what exactly occurs in the main browser window when they hyperlink in the preview window is selected, it would be an obvious design choice to program the browser layout to display in such a fashion as claimed in the instant application.

25. As per claim 19, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 18 (as rejected above).



Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

wherein one of the menu options includes a home menu option and wherein the selection receiving means receives a selection of the home menu option; and

wherein the delivery means delivers the first electronic document including the electronic advertisement in the compact display format.

However, Petropoulos does teach a dedicated preview icon that can function as a menu for controlling previewing ([0010]). In addition, Petropoulos teaches advanced preview icon implementation including separating regions in the preview icon which allows the user to dynamically and automatically determine what to preview via a variety of menu buttons ([0060-61], see also Fig. 5, "552", "Home Page"). Furthermore, Petropoulos teaches a mouse-over technology in which the user may simply move the pointer away from the preview and the window will close and return to the original display ([0054]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include a home menu option to return to the original display. The

rationale for this inclusion is a home option allows a user to easily return to the original content display to avoid the hassle of the typical backward-forward movement in a browser setting. The Examiner notes that although Petropoulos teaches various menu options, but does not explicitly teach a home option specifically in the preview window (i.e. expanded display), the taught menu options could easily include a home menu option. Furthermore, there are a limited number of predictable ways to transition back to the original format. For example, one could either close the preview window (i.e. expanded display) by clicking a typical close "x" button, select a coded "home" button as disclosed in the instant application, or "deselect" (i.e. move away the cursor) the window as is taught by Petropoulos. As such, it would be obvious for Petropoulos to include a home menu option as opposed to its current teachings because the mouse-over technology yields the same functionality of returning to the original display format that the home menu option provides.

26. As per claim 20, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 18 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the electronic advertisement comprises a morphing electronic advertisement that includes instructions for

interpreting user actions to enable an end user system to display the compact display format and the expanded display format ([0023-25], instructions are sent to render content inline with particular result, see also [0042], preview information displayed over the current window or in a window which already exists on results page such as a preview window that can be located anywhere on the results page).

27. As per claim 21, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 18 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the first and second electronic document comprise web pages ([0010], preview information is a "preview window" containing relevant preview information of actual page or document associated with item in results list, see also [0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result).
28. As per claim 22, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 18 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the network locations specified in reference to the one or more menu options comprise network locations provided by or affiliated with a host entity that delivered the first electronic document and the electronic advertisement ([0025-

Art Unit: 3622

26], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0029], contextual information regards URL pertaining to web page, see also [0042], enabling active hyperlinks in preview windows so that a mouse-over or click result in a call to the referenced page as well as enabling further mouse-over, which allows the user to use mouse-over in the preview pane).

29. As per claim 23, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 18 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses further comprising:

wherein the electronic advertisement comprises a target reference to an advertiser network location ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

storage means for storing a price parameter value in association with the electronic advertisement.

However, Petropoulos does teach a user's use of preview information is monitored while the user reviews the results page. More specifically, it monitors which result is being

Art Unit: 3622

previewed by order or rank, the length of each preview, whether there is a click-through, etc. The attributes of user behavior are forwarded across the network and later used to improve relevancy ([0072-79]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include storing a price parameter associated with the electronic advertisement. The Examiner notes that in a electronic advertising environment, it is common for there to be a direct correlation between price and performance parameters. As such, the act of monitoring performance (i.e. user interaction) in an online environment provides a way to measure the effectiveness of the content issued to the user, whether it be search results, banner advertisements, etc. Therefore, although Petropoulos does not explicitly teach storing a price value, it would be obvious for a price value to be present as a result of the monitoring and tracking of user performance recited in the teachings of Petropoulos.

30. As per claim 24, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 23 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses

wherein the selection receiving means receives a third user selection of the target reference, wherein performance is determined to have occurred upon receipt of the selection of the target reference ([0042], functional attributes of preview window include hyperlinks that a user can mouse over or click on which would result in a call to the referenced page).

31. As per claim 25, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 23 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the selection receiving means receives an indication of user activity associated with the expanded display format, wherein performance is determined to have occurred upon receipt of the indication of the user activity ([0042], functional attributes of preview window include the use of a scroll bar, hyperlinks that a user can mouse over or click on which would result in a call to the referenced page, etc., see also [0073], attributes of user behavior tracked and monitored).

32. As per claim 26, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 25 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the user activity comprises a predetermined period of time viewing the expanded display format ([0042], user can

dynamically control the duration of the preview window visibility, see also [0073-75], user's use of preview information monitored including the length of each preview, a long duration indicates high relevancy to a particular result).

33. As per claim 27, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 25 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the user activity comprises the user request to view the expanded display format ([0010], displaying preview information associated with each result item, see also [0025], preview information shown when there is a mouse-over a defined area, see also [0073], user's use of preview information monitored including which result is being previewed).
34. As per claim 28, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 25 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the user activity comprises a predetermined number of user selections of the one or more menu options available in the expanded display format ([0026], preview information include URLs, with respect to URLs used as preview information these URLs will function as links, see also [0054], user may initiate a menu or control system for controlling the function

of the available preview functions, see also [0060-62], user interacts with menu options, see also Fig. 5, "552").

35. As per claim 29, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 18 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses further comprising

storage means that stores a reference to the electronic advertisement for use by the user in retrieving the electronic advertisement ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0029], contextual information regards URL pertaining to web page, see also [0032], preview information includes tags defining the information to be previewed).

36. As per claim 31, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 18 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses

wherein the second electronic document comprises a document provided by the advertiser ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0032], preview information includes an advertisement).



37. As per claim 32, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 31 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the document provided by the advertiser comprises a web page from the advertiser's web site ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0036], web page is actual web page referred by and associated with first result).
38. As per claim 35, Petropoulos discloses an apparatus for delivering advertising comprising:
- an electronic advertisement output system **for delivering** a first electronic document including an electronic advertisement in a compact display format, wherein the electronic advertisement **can be transitioned** from the compact display format into an expanded display format upon a first user selection of an expansion icon associated with the electronic, advertisement, the expanded display format comprising one or more menu options and a reference to a network location for retrieving specified content associated with each menu option ([0020], search results page contains first result "53" and second result "54", see also Fig. 1, "53" and "54", see also [0023-25], preview window renders

Art Unit: 3622

content inline with particular result, see also [0038], preview icon alerts a user to the preview feature and allows user to select preview using navigation of mouse pointer, see also Fig. 1, "63" and "64");

a selection receiving module that receives a second user selection of one of the one or more menu options after the electronic advertisement has been transitioned from the compact display format to the expanded display format ([0032], preview information is an advertisement, see also [0042], preview information display over current window or in preview window, functional attributes of preview window include hyperlinks that a user can mouse over or click on, see also [0054], user may initiate a menu or control system for the controlling the function of the available preview functions, see also Fig. 1, "55").

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

a delivery module that delivers a second electronic document including content from the referenced network location associated with the menu option selected and including the electronic advertisement in the expanded display format.

However, Petropoulos does teach enabling active hyperlinks in preview windows that when clicked result in a call to the referenced page as well as enabling further mouse-over, which allows the user to use mouse-over in the preview pane ([0042], see also [0073-79]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include delivering content associated with a selected menu option including the advertisement in the expanded display format. The rationale for this inclusion would enable Petropoulos to deliver the content while maintaining the advertising component in direct view of the user. This increase in ad exposure could result in a higher probability of conversion. Furthermore, the Examiner notes that although Petropoulos does not explicitly teach what exactly occurs in the main browser window when they hyperlink in the preview window is selected, it would be an obvious design choice to program the browser layout to display in such a fashion as claimed in the instant application.

39. As per claim 36, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

wherein one of the menu options includes a home menu option and wherein the selection receiving means receives a selection of the home menu option; and

wherein the delivery module delivers the first electronic document including the electronic advertisement in the compact display format.

However, Petropoulos does teach a dedicated preview icon that can function as a menu for controlling previewing ([0010]). In addition, Petropoulos teaches advanced preview icon implementation including separating regions in the preview icon which allows the user to dynamically and automatically determine what to preview via a variety of menu buttons ([0060-61], see also Fig. 5, "552", "Home Page"). Furthermore, Petropoulos teaches a mouse-over technology in which the user may simply move the pointer away from the preview and the window will close and return to the original display ([0054]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include a home menu option to return to the original display. The

rationale for this inclusion is a home option allows a user to easily return to the original content display to avoid the hassle of the typical backward-forward movement in a browser setting. The Examiner notes that although Petropoulos teaches various menu options, but does not explicitly teach a home option specifically in the preview window (i.e. expanded display), the taught menu options could easily include a home menu option. Furthermore, there are a limited number of predictable ways to transition back to the original format. For example, one could either close the preview window (i.e. expanded display) by clicking a typical close "x" button, select a coded "home" button as disclosed in the instant application, or "deselect" (i.e. move away the cursor) the window as is taught by Petropoulos. As such, it would be obvious for Petropoulos to include a home menu option as opposed to its current teachings because the mouse-over technology yields the same functionality of returning to the original display format that the home menu option provides.

40. As per claim 37, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the electronic advertisement comprises a morphing electronic advertisement that includes instructions for

interpreting user actions to enable an end user system to display the compact display format and the expanded display format ([0023-25], instructions are sent to render content inline with particular result, see also [0042], preview information displayed over the current window or in a window which already exists on results page such as a preview window that can be located anywhere on the results page).

41. As per claim 38, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the first and second electronic document comprise web pages ([0010], preview information is a "preview window" containing relevant preview information of actual page or document associated with item in results list, see also [0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result).
42. As per claim 39, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the network locations specified in reference to the one or more menu options comprise network locations provided by or affiliated with a host entity that delivered the first electronic document and the electronic advertisement ([0025-

Art Unit: 3622

26], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0029], contextual information regards URL pertaining to web page, see also [0042], enabling active hyperlinks in preview windows so that a mouse-over or click result in a call to the referenced page as well as enabling further mouse-over, which allows the user to use mouse-over in the preview pane).

43. As per claim 40, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses further comprising:

wherein the electronic advertisement comprises a target reference to an advertiser network location ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

a database system for storing a price parameter value in association with the electronic advertisement.

However, Petropoulos does teach a user's use of preview information is monitored while the user reviews the results page. More specifically, it monitors which result is being

Art Unit: 3622

previewed by order or rank, the length of each preview, whether there is a click-through, etc. The attributes of user behavior are forwarded across the network and later used to improve relevancy ([0072-79]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include storing a price parameter associated with the electronic advertisement. The Examiner notes that in a electronic advertising environment, it is common for there to be a direct correlation between price and performance parameters. As such, the act of monitoring performance (i.e. user interaction) in an online environment provides a way to measure the effectiveness of the content issued to the user, whether it be search results, banner advertisements, etc. Therefore, although Petropoulos does not explicitly teach storing a price value, it would be obvious for a price value to be present as a result of the monitoring and tracking of user performance recited in the teachings of Petropoulos.

44. As per claim 41, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses



wherein the selection receiving module receives a third user selection of the target reference wherein performance is determined to have occurred upon receipt of the selection of the target reference ([0042], functional attributes of preview window include hyperlinks that a user can mouse over or click on which would result in a call to the referenced page).

45. As per claim 42, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the selection receiving module receives an indication of user activity associated with the expanded display format, wherein performance is determined to have occurred upon receipt of the indication of the user activity ([0042], functional attributes of preview window include the use of a scroll bar, hyperlinks that a user can mouse over or click on which would result in a call to the referenced page, etc., see also [0073], attributes of user behavior tracked and monitored).

46. As per claim 43, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 42 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the user activity comprises a predetermined period of time viewing the expanded display format ([0042], user can

dynamically control the duration of the preview window visibility, see also [0073-75], user's use of preview information monitored including the length of each preview, a long duration indicates high relevancy to a particular result).

47. As per claim 44, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 42 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the user activity comprises the user request to view the expanded display format ([0010], displaying preview information associated with each result item, see also [0025], preview information shown when there is a mouse-over a defined area, see also [0073], user's use of preview information monitored including which result is being previewed).
48. As per claim 45, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 42 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the user activity comprises a predetermined number of user selections of the one or more menu options available in the expanded display format ([0026], preview information include URLs, with respect to URLs used as preview information these URLs will function as links, see also [0054], user may initiate a menu or control system for controlling the function

Art Unit: 3622

of the available preview functions, see also [0060-62], user interacts with menu options, see also Fig. 5, "552").

49. As per claim 46, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses further comprising

a storage system that stores a reference to the electronic advertisement for use by the user in retrieving the electronic advertisement ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0029], contextual information regards URL pertaining to web page, see also [0032], preview information includes tags defining the information to be previewed).

50. As per claim 48, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses

wherein the second electronic document comprises a document provided by the advertiser ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0032], preview information includes an advertisement).

51. As per claim 49, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 47 (as rejected above). Petropoulos further discloses wherein the document provided by the advertiser comprises a web page from the advertiser's web site ([0025], preview information displays actual content or the web page referred by or associated with the first result, see also [0036], web page is actual web page referred by and associated with first result).
52. **Claims 13, 16, 30, 33, 47 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petropoulos et al. (US 2003/0146939 A1) (hereinafter Petropoulos) in view of Ogura et al. (US 2002/0165767 A1) (hereinafter Ogura).**
53. As per claim 13, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 12 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

wherein, the user may bookmark the electronic advertisement using the reference.

However, Ogura teaches a bookmark button that when pressed allows a user to easily link with the advertisement and store

Art Unit: 3622

the bookmark in an advertisement log (bookmark) table ([0092], see also [0118-122]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include the capability to bookmark an electronic advertisement. The rationale for combining in this manner is that both Petropoulos and Ogura are directed to an online environment. Furthermore, this inclusion would enable Petropoulos to provide a user that ability to save desired content and easily access it again at a later time, thus increasing the likelihood of a user making a purchase or some other typical online conversion.

54. As per claim 16, Petropoulos discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 1 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

wherein the second electronic document comprises an electronic document that includes functionality to permit the user to purchase one or more items.

Art Unit: 3622

However, Ogura teaches an online shopping environment allowing a user to purchase a piece of merchandising from a browsing site ([0158]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include online shopping functionality. The rationale for combining in this manner is that both Petropoulos and Ogura are directed to an online environment. Furthermore, this inclusion would enable Petropoulos to provide a user the ability to purchase desired merchandise, thus increasing revenue for the online system and further increasing campaign success for both the direct online system as well as any third-party merchants connected with the online environment.

55. As per claim 30, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 29 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

wherein the user may bookmark the electronic advertisement using the reference.

However, Ogura teaches a bookmark button that when pressed allows a user to easily link with the advertisement and store the bookmark in an advertisement log (bookmark) table ([0092], see also [0118-122]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include the capability to bookmark an electronic advertisement. The rationale for combining in this manner is that both Petropoulos and Ogura are directed to an online environment. Furthermore, this inclusion would enable Petropoulos to provide a user that ability to save desired content and easily access it again at a later time, thus increasing the likelihood of a user making a purchase or some other typical online conversion.

56. As per claim 33, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 18 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose wherein the second electronic document comprises an electronic document that includes functionality to permit the user to purchase one or more items.

However, Ogura teaches an online shopping environment allowing a user to purchase a piece of merchandising from a browsing site ([0158]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include online shopping functionality. The rationale for combining in this manner is that both Petropoulos and Ogura are directed to an online environment. Furthermore, this inclusion would enable Petropoulos to provide a user the ability to purchase desired merchandise, thus increasing revenue for the online system and further increasing campaign success for both the direct online system as well as any third-party merchants connected with the online environment.

57. As per claim 47, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 45 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

wherein the user may bookmark the electronic advertisement using the reference.



Art Unit: 3622

However, Ogura teaches a bookmark button that when pressed allows a user to easily link with the advertisement and store the bookmark in an advertisement log (bookmark) table ([0092], see also [0118-122]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include the capability to bookmark an electronic advertisement. The rationale for combining in this manner is that both Petropoulos and Ogura are directed to an online environment. Furthermore, this inclusion would enable Petropoulos to provide a user that ability to save desired content and easily access it again at a later time, thus increasing the likelihood of a user making a purchase or some other typical online conversion.

58. As per claim 50, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 35 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose

wherein the second electronic document comprises an electronic document that includes functionality to permit the user to purchase one or more items.

However, Ogura teaches an online shopping environment allowing a user to purchase a piece of merchandising from a browsing site ([0158]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include online shopping functionality. The rationale for combining in this manner is that both Petropoulos and Ogura are directed to an online environment. Furthermore, this inclusion would enable Petropoulos to provide a user the ability to purchase desired merchandise, thus increasing revenue for the online system and further increasing campaign success for both the direct online system as well as any third-party merchants connected with the online environment.

59. Claims 17 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petropoulos et al. (US 2003/0146939 A1) (hereinafter Petropoulos) in view of Ogura et al. (US 2002/0165767 A1) (hereinafter Ogura) as applied to claims 13, 16, 30, 33, 47 and 50 above, and further in view of Morgenthaler et al. (U.S. 2002/0032677) (hereinafter Morgenthaler).

60. As per claim 17, Petropoulos in view of Ogura discloses the computer-implemented method of claim 16 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose further comprising:  
receiving feedback information related to a user's purchase  
of one or more items.

However, Morgenthaler teaches monitoring a user's Internet use habits and items purchased on the Internet via a cookie ([0055]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos and Ogura to include tracking user purchases. The rationale for combining in this manner is that Petropoulos, Ogura and Morgenthaler are all directed to an online environment. Furthermore, tracking user purchases would enable Petropoulos and Ogura to determine the effectiveness of an advertisement and adjust the campaign accordingly to achieve and maintain successful results.

61. As per claim 34, Petropoulos in view of Ogura discloses the apparatus of claim 33 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose further comprising feedback means for receiving feedback information related to a user's purchase of one or more items.

However, Morgenthaler teaches monitoring a user's Internet use habits and items purchased on the Internet via a cookie ([0055]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos and Ogura to include tracking user purchases. The rationale for combining in this manner is that Petropoulos, Ogura and Morgenthaler are all directed to an online environment. Furthermore, tracking user purchases would enable Petropoulos and Ogura to determine the effectiveness of an advertisement and adjust the campaign accordingly to achieve and maintain successful results.

62. **Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petropoulos et al. (US 2003/0146939 A1)**

**(hereinafter Petropoulos) in view of Morgenthaler et al. (U.S. 2002/0032677) (hereinafter Morgenthaler).**

63. As per claim 51, Petropoulos discloses the apparatus of claim 49 (as rejected above).

Petropoulos does not explicitly disclose further comprising a feedback module that receives feedback information related to a user's purchase of one or more items.

However, Morgenthaler teaches monitoring a user's Internet use habits and items purchased on the Internet via a cookie ([0055]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Petropoulos to include tracking user purchases. The rationale for combining in this manner is that Petropoulos and Morgenthaler are directed to an online environment. Furthermore, tracking user purchases would enable Petropoulos to determine the effectiveness of an advertisement and adjust the campaign accordingly to achieve and maintain successful results.

***Response to Arguments***

64. Applicant's arguments filed 01/08/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner notes the arguments are directed to the claims, as amended. However, the Examiner will address the arguments below to provide Applicant with further clarification of the applied references and the Examiner's interpretation.

65. In the remarks, the Applicant argues with respect to claim 1 that Petropoulos fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "delivering a first electronic document including an electronic advertisement in a compact display format, wherein the electronic advertisement can be **transitioned from the compact display format into an expanded display format** upon a first user selection of an expansion icon associated with the electronic advertisement...receiving a second user selection of one of the one or more menu options **after the electronic advertisement has been transitioned from the compact display format to the expanded display format in the first electronic document.**" More specifically, the Applicant argues that:

1. a search result displayed in the Petropoulos system is not "an electronic advertisement in a compact

display format," because Petropoulos' search result is not an advertisement.

2. the relied portions of Petropoulos never transitions any advertisement from a compact display format to an expanded display format. Even if the search result was an advertisement, the search result is never transitioned into the preview information.

In response to these arguments, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

66. As per argument 1, the Examiner respectfully asserts that a search result provided to a user in response to a query is indeed an advertisement. The search result is "advertising" a webpage, document, etc. to the user indicating the location of where the requested information can be found. Advertisements can be of various formats such as textual, graphical, etc. As such, the Examiner exerts that the search result, as disclosed in Petropoulos, is indeed an advertisement.

As per argument 2, the Examiner respectfully asserts that the relied portions of Petropoulos do indeed "transition" from a compact display format to an expanded display format. The Examiner has provided citations in the rejection above. For further clarification, the Examiner is interpreting the search

results as disclosed in Petropoulos to be the first display format (i.e. compact). When that information is then previewed, content associated with that particular search result is displayed in a preview window, thus establishing the second display format (i.e. expanded). As per Petropoulos paragraphs [0023-26], this is done via instructions sent to the user's web browser to render the content inline with the particular search result. Thus, the search result has been "transitioned" via the disclosed instructions to an expanded format displayed in the preview window.

Based on these interpretations, the Examiner asserts that the claimed limitations are indeed satisfied by Petropoulos. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is hereby maintained.

Furthermore, claims 2-51, which the Applicant argues as allowable for similar reasons as claim 1 above, are also maintained as rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

67. Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied



Art Unit: 3622

to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

68. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM A. BRANDENBURG whose telephone number is (571)270-5488. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30 am - 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WB

/W. A. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 3622

/John Van Bramer/

Examiner, Art Unit 3622